



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

21

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/756,762	01/10/2001	Hiroshi Watanabe	50253-280	6562
35690	7590	03/21/2005	EXAMINER	
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C. P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398			WOZNIAK, JAMES S	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2655		
DATE MAILED: 03/21/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/756,762	WATANABE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	James S. Wozniak	2655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2-7 and 11-15 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2-7 and 11-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the office action from 7/21/2004, the applicant has submitted an amendment, filed 10/18/2004, amending Claims 2, 5, 7, 11, and 15, while arguing to traverse the art rejection based on the limitation regarding multibyte binary words comprising a multibyte locale for the single byte language (*Amendment, Page 6*). Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, however the previous rejection is maintained, altered only with respect to the amended claims and without the addition of any further prior art, due to the reasons listed below in the response to arguments.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

With respect to **Claims 2 and 11**, the applicant argues that Edberg et al (*U.S. Patent: 5,682,158*) fails to teach multibyte binary words comprising a multibyte locale for the single byte language, however, as recited in the previous office action Edberg teaches the ability to convert a single byte word to a multibyte word (Pages 2-3).

The converted multibyte words disclosed by Edberg correspond to a single byte version of the word (as per a Unicode mapping table, Fig. 20, Element 2014) and are part of a national

language character set that is specific to a region which uses such characters (*nation*, *Col. 23, Lines 14-18*). According to Webster's New World Dictionary (1995), a locale refers to a locality, which is a place or district (*nation*) (Page 346). Therefore, the converted multibyte words, which are specific to a *national* character set (locale) and correspond to a single byte version of the words through a mapping table, are a functional equivalent of a "multibyte locale of the single byte language."

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a language table of an internationalized computer application that binds to a computer application at run time and contains all language-specific processing information and conventions specific to a particular locale) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Thus, the rejection of Claims 2 and 11 is maintained.

With respect to **Claim 5**, the applicant argues that Chou (*U.S. Patent: 5,583,761*) fails to teach displaying multibyte binary words so as to create a visual distinction between characters represented in multibyte character words and characters represented in ASCII, however it is the combination of Edberg and Chou that teaches this limitation. As noted in the previous office action, Edberg teaches ASCII to Unicode conversion, but does not provide a visual distinction for multibyte words (*Page 6*). Chou teaches a specialized font designation for the display of "multiple byte characters" (*Col. 6, Line 62- Col. 7, Line 20*). Therefore, a visual distinction

would be obtained since only multiple byte characters (Unicode) would receive a specialized font designation. Thus, Claim 5 remains rejected.

Claims 7, 14, and 15 are traversed for the reasons given with respect to Claims 2 and 11, and thus, also remain rejected for similar reasons.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 12, and 13 are argued as further limiting their parent claims (*Amendment, Page 7*). Thus, since the rejection of claims 2 and 11 is maintained, Claims 3, 4, 6, 12, and 13 remain rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 2, 11, and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Edberg et al (*U.S. Patent: 5,682,158*).

With respect to **Claim 2**, Edberg discloses:

Computer implemented method of implementing a multibyte locale in a single byte language, comprising the steps of:

Providing an element for performing the step of creating a mapping between multibyte binary words and characters of said single byte language (*Unicode mapping table, Col. 22, Line*

47- Col. 23, Line 4, which would require an inherent step of table creation, and Fig. 20, Element 2014); and

Providing an element for performing the step of providing for conversion of representations of characters of said single byte language into corresponding multibyte binary words specified by said mapping (*To-Unicode conversion, Col. 22, Line 47- Col. 23, Line 18*), wherein the multibyte binary words comprise a multibyte locale for the single byte language (*converted multibyte words corresponding to a single byte version of a word as per a Unicode mapping table, Fig. 20, Element 2014, that are part of a national language character set that is specific to a region (nation) which uses such characters, Col. 23, Lines 14-18*).

Furthermore, Edberg discloses converting between ASCII (single-byte) and Unicode (multibyte) characters (*examples of mapping ASCII to Unicode, Col. 11, Line 52- Col. 12, Line 35*).

Claim 11 contains subject matter similar to Claim 2, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons. Additionally, Edberg discloses a computer readable medium containing program instructions for implementing the method of Claim 2 (*Col. 4, Lines 32-49*).

Claim 14 contains subject matter similar to Claim 11, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons. Also, Edberg teaches a mapping table used in the To-Unicode conversion process as shown in Fig. 20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 3, 7, 12, 13, and 15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edberg et al in view of Calhoun (*U.S. Patent: 5,819,303*), and further in view of Tsuchimura (*U.S. Patent: 5,799,303*).

With respect to **Claim 3**, Edberg teaches the ASCII to Unicode conversion utilizing a mapping table, as applied to Claim 2. Edberg does not teach a sorting function used for single and multiple byte characters, wherein the multiple byte character sort order differs from that of the single byte, however, Calhoun recites

Providing an element for performing the step of providing a sort function which sorts multibyte binary words in a sort order customary for said single byte language (*character order sorting, Col. 5, Lines 13-29*, *Also, the examiner takes official notice that it is well known to sort words according to character data so as to provide a logical word order within a data set based upon alphabetical order*).

Also, the examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art that the sort order of a binary sort order would differ from that of a multibyte sort order since it is well known in the art that character sorting is performed according character codes (*evidenced by Tsuchimura in Col. 2, Lines 1-21*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention that the sorting process used for multibyte characters would result in a different sorting order. This altered order results due to the fact that the converted characters are of the same significance yet indicated in different ways, and thus are considered as different characters with a different sorting order (*Col. 2, Lines 11-21*). Also, it would have been inherent,

that if the aforementioned sorting operation failed, an original character order would be maintained, thus resulting in an incorrect sorting order.

Edberg, Calhoun, and Tsuchimura are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in text processing. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the character sorting method taught by Calhoun having a differing multibyte character sorting order as evidenced by Tsuchimura with the ASCII to Unicode conversion utilizing a mapping table to provide improved access of word data within a ASCII to Unicode conversion system through the logical arrangement of character data (*Tsuchimura, Col. 1, Lines 29-33*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Calhoun, Tsuchimura, and Edberg for the benefit of obtaining a means of character data organization within a single-byte to multibyte character conversion system, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 3.

Claim 7 contains subject matter similar to Claims 2, 3, and 4, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 12 contains subject matter similar to Claim 4, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 13 contains subject matter similar to Claims 3 and 11, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 15 contains subject matter similar to Claims 7 and 11, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

7. **Claim 4** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edberg et al in view of Calhoun (*U.S. Patent: 5,819,303*).

With respect to **Claim 4**, Edberg teaches the ASCII to Unicode conversion utilizing a mapping table, as applied to Claim 2. Edberg does not specifically suggest providing a means for date conversion, however, Calhoun recites:

Providing an element for performing the step of defining a date representation for a particular locale (*Col. 5, Lines 13-29*); and

Providing an element for performing the step of providing a date function which converts an internationalized date representation to said date representation for a particular locale whereby failure to invoke said date function of the multibyte locale will result in a different date representation from said date representation customary for said locale (*date format conversion, Col. 5, Lines 13-29. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, that if the conversion to the proper date format were unavailable, the original date format would be displayed*).

Edberg and Calhoun are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in text processing. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the method of date format conversion as taught by Calhoun with the ASCII to Unicode conversion utilizing a mapping table to provide further text conversion means that will allow a user to view a date in a desired and comprehensible format. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Calhoun with Edberg for the benefit of obtaining further text conversion means within a single-byte to multibyte character conversion

system to allow a user to view a date in a comprehensible format, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 4.

8. **Claims 5 and 6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edberg et al in view of Chou (*U.S. Patent: 5,583,761*).

With respect to **Claim 5**, Edberg teaches the ASCII to Unicode conversion utilizing a mapping table, as applied to Claim 2. Edberg does not teach providing a visual distinction for multibyte words on a display, however, Chou recites:

Providing an element for performing the step of providing for display of said multibyte binary words so as to create a visual distinction between characters represented in said multibyte binary words and characters represented in ASCII (*font designation assigned to multibyte characters, Col. 6, Line 62- Col. 7, Line 20*).

Edberg and Chou are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in text processing. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the method of designating specific fonts for multibyte characters as taught by Chou with the ASCII to Unicode conversion utilizing a mapping table as taught by Edberg in order to provide a user with a means of discerning foreign language text, represented by multibyte characters, through a font designation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chou with Edberg for the benefit of providing a user with the ability to easily recognize a multibyte character on a text display through font designation, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 5.

With respect to **Claim 6**, Chou further recites:

Visual distinction relates to one of font, color or spacing (*font, Col. 6, Line 62- Col. 7, Line 20*).

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S. Wozniak whose telephone number is (703) 305-8669 and email is James.Wozniak@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays, 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doris To can be reached at (703) 305-4827. The fax/phone number for the Technology Center 2600 where this application is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the technology center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

James S. Wozniak
3/10/2005


David L. Ometz
Primary Examiner